



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.        | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.        |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 10/608,888             | 06/26/2003  | Eran Steinberg       | FN102-C             | 7816                    |
| 30349                  | 7590        | 08/13/2007           |                     | EXAMINER                |
| JACKSON & CO., LLP     |             |                      |                     | MADDEN, GREGORY VINCENT |
| 6114 LA SALLE AVENUE   |             |                      |                     |                         |
| #507                   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER            |
| OAKLAND, CA 94611-2802 |             |                      | 2622                |                         |
|                        |             |                      |                     |                         |
|                        |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE           |
|                        |             |                      | 08/13/2007          | PAPER                   |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                               |                  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | Application No.               | Applicant(s)     |
|                          | 10/608,888                    | STEINBERG ET AL. |
|                          | Examiner<br>Gregory V. Madden | Art Unit<br>2622 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory V. Madden. (3) Andy Smith.

(2) Ngoc Yen Vu. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 07 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5, 17, and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ray et al. (6,940,545) and Sannoh et al. (2003/0071908).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



NGOC-YEN VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner agreed that removing "location of said faces within said captured image" from limitation (e) in claim 1 would eliminate the Ray et al. reference as a 102(e) reference. Examiner suggested further defining the limitation of "calculating a weighted average on the individual objects of said groups" to clarify that the weighted averaging is involved in calculating the estimated importance of the detected face regions. As for claim 5, the Examiner believes that the Sannoh reference shows the manual removal of one or more groups of pixels detected as faces, as Sannoh teaches that a user can manually select a particular detected face as a "ranging area", thereby inherently manually "removing" the other plurality of groups of pixels detected as faces. Finally, regarding claims 17 and 21, the Examiner agreed that the Ray reference fails to teach that the location of the face is automatically adjusted based upon comparison of an initial parameter with a desired parameter.